



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Στοιχεῖα τοῦ Θείου αὐτοῦ ἡμέρου, αὐτοῦ τοῦ οὐρανού αὐτοῦ τοῦ οὐρανού.

Luke ii. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 18.

JUNE, 1853.

{ Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d.
Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Is the Protestant Bible a corrupt and mutilated translation of the Holy Scriptures? No. 2.	61
The Catholic Doctrine on the Use of the Bible, by Cardinal Wiseman	62
Festival of the translation of the Relics of SS. Patrick, Brigid, and Columbkille—June 9	63
The Two Pictures.—A Dispute	64
On the Worship of Reliques	64
Talk of the Road—No. XIII.	65
Christianity the Religion of the Heart	66
The Rev. Mr. Kelsh, R.C.C., and the CATHOLIC LAYMAN	67
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Mr. E. Power on Origen and Purgatory	67
Mr. Dermot MacManus on the Internal Evidences of the Catholic Religion	69
The CATHOLIC LAYMAN in Kilpatrick, by Dennis Gasteen	70
Farming Operations for June	71

IS THE PROTESTANT BIBLE A CORRUPT AND MUTILATED TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?

NO. II.

AFTER the English Reformation several persons undertook to translate and publish the Holy Scriptures in English. Thus there came to be several translations, differing from each other in words and phrases, though generally agreeing in substance. Some of these were the work of individuals, and never had any sanction from the Church of England.

This was felt to be unsatisfactory, and the more so, as it gave a handle to those who wished to have no Bible in English, to charge the English Church with faults which were found only in translations made by private persons, and for which the Church was not responsible. Thus, the great Roman Catholic book on this subject, "Ward's Errata," complains loudly of the heresy of the Protestant Bible, in translating the Greek word *ekklēsia*, "congregation," instead of "church." It is true, it was translated "congregation," in Tyndal's translation, which never was authorized; but in the "Bishop's Bible," which was then read in the churches, it was translated "church."

To take away such handles for misrepresentation, as well as to make the translation as perfect as possible, in the beginning of the reign of King James I., about 50 of the most learned men in England were appointed to revise the translation; which work they performed with great care during several years, and it was at length published in the year 1611. Since that time no other translation has been used by Protestants; and it has often been spoken of with admiration by learned Roman Catholics, as by Bishop Doyle in Ireland, and, lately, by Bishop Kenrick in America.

Seeing that none of the old translations have been used by Protestants for two hundred and forty years, it seems needless to discuss their merits now, and we should, perhaps, not have mentioned them, but that some Roman Catholic writers still bring them forward as proofs of the variations of Protestants. They might be satisfied with the fact that, for 240 years, Protestants have not found reason to make any variations in their translation.

But how stands the fact with the Douay Bible, as to "variations?" Roman Catholics will, perhaps, be surprised to hear us talk of such a thing; they will suppose that their translation must be perfect, and can have no "variation." We ask them to attend to us now.

If any one was to get a Douay Bible, published about 50 or 60 years ago, or even the Douay Bible published in Dublin, by Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in the year 1816 (only 37 years ago), and were to compare this with the Douay Bible now published, he would find much more difference between these two Douay Bibles, than he would find between the present Douay Bible and the Protestant Bible!

The writer of this has diligently compared the three Books—that is, the old Douay Bible, the new Douay Bible, and the Protestant Bible—through many of the Books of the New Testament; and he can answer for the truth of this strange fact. He found about fifteen hundred variations in the Gospel of St. Matthew alone, between

the old Douay Bible and the new Douay Bible! Many of these variations are of no importance in themselves; they are merely alterations of words without altering the sense; but many of them are of great importance. In many places, the very things in the Protestant translation which used to be cried out against by Roman Catholics, as proofs of the heresy of Protestants, are now found standing in the new Douay Bible, in the very words of the Protestant Bible! Proofs and instances of this strange fact will be given presently.

There is another fact not less strange; most of the corrections that have been made in the Douay Bible have been taken out of the Protestant Bible.

Of the 1500 alterations made in the Gospel of St. Matthew in the Douay Bible, about 1200 are taken from the Protestant Bible; the other 300 that are not taken from the Protestant Bible are generally of least consequence; all the most important corrections are taken from the Protestant Bible. We will give proofs and instances of this fact too. And then we think it will be fair to ask those Roman Catholics, who say, like the Mayo Monk and the editor of the *Tablet*, that the Douay Bible is God's Book, and the Protestant Bible the Devil's Book, how it came to pass that God's Book was corrected out of the Devil's Book? For the fact is certain that the persons who were entrusted with the correction of the Douay Bible, did take the Protestant Bible, as their best and surest guide in making their corrections.

We proceed now to give some instances of the importance of the changes that have been made in the Douay Bible.

Matthew, chap. i., v. 23. The old Douay Bible read, "And he knew her not, till she brought forth her first-born son, and called his name Jesus." The Protestant Bible reads, "and He called his name Jesus." On this Dr. Ward in his "errata" says (p. 59), "to take from the Holy Mother of God what honour they can, they translate that 'He' (viz. Joseph) called his name Jesus, and why not 'She' as well as 'He?' &c." Yet, in the Douay Bibles now published we read, "and He called his name Jesus." So they have found out that what Dr. Ward railed at in the Protestant Bible as dishonouring the Blessed Virgin, is right after all, and they have corrected the Douay Bible accordingly.

Here is another instance from 1 Cor., chap. xv., v. 55. The Douay Bibles, in Dr. Ward's times had the verse thus, "Where is, O Death, thy sting? where is, O Hell, thy victory?" The Protestant Bible has, "O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?" On this Dr. Ward says, "Thus all along, whenever they find the word Hell—that is, when it signifies the place where the Holy Fathers of the Old Testament rested, called by the Church Limbus patrum, they are sure to translate it grave. . . With what face, then, can they look upon these wilful corruptions of theirs?"

Yet, when we turn to the Douay Bible now, we find this word Hell left out, and the verse runs thus—"Oh, Death, where is thy victory? Oh, Death, where is thy sting?"

Again, Hebrews, chap. ii., v. 9, was thus translated in the old Douay Bibles—"But him that was a little lessened under the angels, we see Jesus, because of the passion of death, crowned with glory and honour." The Protestant Bible has: "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour."

On this Dr. Ward complains that Beza had translated it different from either; and, of the Protestant version, he says—"But in their last translation they so place the words that they will have it left so ambiguous, as you may follow which sense you will; *intolerable is their deceit!*" But if any one will look at the Douay Bible now, he will find the passage, *word for word*, as it is in the Protestant Bible, which Dr. Ward cried out against as being intolerably deceitful!

Again, in 2 Peter, chap. i., v. 15, the old Douay Bible had, "And I will do my endeavour, you to have often after my decease also, that you may keep a memory of these things." The Protestant Bible has, "Moreover, I will endeavour that ye may be able, after my decease, to have these things always in remembrance." A plain reader might be apt to think that the only difference here was that the Douay Bible made the apostle speak nonsense, and the Protestant Bible makes him speak sense. But Dr. Ward

saw a greater difference: he says (p. 59)—"St. Peter speaks so ambiguously, either *that he will remember them after his death*, or that they shall remember him; but the Calvinists restrain the sense of this place, without any necessity, and that against the prayers and intercession of saints for us." But if we look to the Douay Bible now, we read it thus—"And I will do my endeavour, that after my decease also, you may often have, whereby you may keep a memory of these things." This translation "restrains the sense" to the very meaning of the Protestant Bible; and that, too, as Dr. Ward says, "against the prayer and intercession of saints for us."

Our readers will observe that in two of the passages above, the correctors of the Douay have adopted the very words of the Protestant Bible. We could fill our whole paper with examples, but we must be brief.

The old Douay Bibles were full of Latin words, not translated. The preface gave the reasons thus—"These words we thought it far better to keep in the text, and to tell their signification in the margin, or in a table for that purpose, *than to disgrace both the text and them with translating them.*" They give a long list of such words, most of which are now translated in the Douay Bible just as they are in the Protestant Bible. As, for instance, Matthew, chap. xxvii., v. 62, the old Douay Bible had "Parasceve"; the Protestant Bible had "the day of the preparation," which the Douay translator said was "a cold translation, and short of the sense;" yet the Douay Bible now has "the day of preparation."

Again: the preface to the old Douay Bibles said, "how is it possible to express evangelize but as we do, *Evangelize?* For *evangelium* being the Gospel, what is *evangelizo* or to *evangelize*, but to show the glad tidings of the Gospel, of the time of grace, of all Christ's benefits? ALL WHICH SIGNIFICATION IS LOST, by translating as the English Bibles do, *I bring you good tidings.*—Luke, chap. ii., v. 10. Yet, if we look to that verse now in the Douay Bible, we find it translated, "I bring you good tidings."

The preface of the old Douay Bible took great credit to itself for translating in Eph. vi., 12, "The spirituals of wickedness in the celestials," of which it is not easy to see the sense. But the Douay Bible now has "Against the spirits of wickedness in the high places;" which is taken from the Protestant Bible, and the note in its margin.

We could fill a book with instances of places in which the Douay Bible has been corrected, to make it agree with the Protestant Bible; but we must stop after one instance more. The old Douay Bibles always translated, "our Lord," instead of "the Lord," though any one who knows either Greek or Latin knows that the latter is beyond all question the true translation. They give the reason for this in a note to 1 Tim., chap. vi., v. 20. Speaking of the words used by Protestants they say, "and though some of the said terms have been by some occasion without ill meaning, spoken by Catholics, before these heretics arose, yet now, knowing them to be the proper speeches of heretics, Christian men are bound to avoid them. . . As now we Catholics must not say '*The Lord*,' but '*our Lord*,' as we say *our Lady* for his mother, not *the Lady*." So, in some hundreds of places, they translated wrong, because the Protestant Bible translated right. But in the new Douay Bibles all these places are changed to agree with the Protestant Bible.

Roman Catholics may wish to know when all these changes in the Douay Bible were made. The oldest edition, in which we happen to have seen these new improvements, is a Douay New Testament, published by Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in 1803. There may have been earlier editions with the corrections, and we should be obliged to any one who could give us information about this.

It is a curious fact, that this same Dr. Troy, 13 years after, should have published a large Douay Bible (quarto, Coyne, 1816) without the alterations, and exactly the same as the old Douay Bibles. It would seem that there must have been great uncertainty then as to what the Roman Catholic translation ought to be: and, perhaps, a great struggle about it. But the corrected version conquered in the end. We do not complain of this; we approve of all those corrections. But we think it unreasonable of Roman Catholics now to complain that corrections were made in the Protestant translation 250 years ago, when they

themselves have made so many thousand corrections in theirs within 50 years past. And we think it very unreasonable that any Roman Catholic should say, as the poor monk in Mayo, and Mr. Lucas, the editor of the *Tablet*, have said, that the Protestant Bible is "the Devil's Book," when, in fact, it is the Book by which their own translation has been corrected. We ask Roman Catholics to remember that the Roman Catholic Bibles now circulated, with the approbation of all the Roman Catholic bishops, *have been corrected by the Protestant Bible*. Surely, then, they cannot think that the Protestant Bible is "the Devil's Book."

We showed in our last paper, that only for the Protestant Bible, Roman Catholics would never have had the Douay Bible at all. We have now showed them that the Douay Bible has been corrected in a vast number of places, and many of them very important places, by the Protestant Bible. This may well lead them to give a candid consideration to the things in which the two translations still differ. We shall return to this part of the subject again.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE ON THE USE OF THE BIBLE.

BY HIS EMINENCE, CARDINAL WISEMAN.

IT was with feelings and expectations of a mixed kind that we began the perusal of this tract. We are glad, at any time, to meet with an argument written by a modern Roman Catholic divine, addressed to the members of his own communion; for, in quoting his words, or in stating their substance, with references to his text, we are safe from the suspicion of intentional mis-statement. When we took up a paper, not only re-published, but given to the world under the high sounding name of Cardinal Wiseman, we looked for that which, indeed, we found—ability, eloquence, a certain plausibility of reasoning and still more of manner. But we also expected an appearance of candour, and a line of argument more weighty, more difficult to meet in reply, than we think this tract presents: we did not anticipate that the manly intellect and well-known talent and learning of Cardinal Wiseman could stoop to such weapons as shallow misrepresentation; or rely upon those hacknied sophistries which we so often find palmed in place of argument upon Roman Catholics to justify the restricted use of the Holy Scriptures. Whether these remarks are just we shall presently leave to the candour of our readers.

This paper first appeared in the *The Dublin Review*, under the title of "The Bible in Maynooth." It purports to be a review of an introductory work on Scripture, by the Most Rev. Dr. Dixon, then professor of the Holy Scriptures at the College of Maynooth. In its present form, however, a very small portion of it is devoted to the notice of that work; and of that portion, none but the few opening sentences call for any observation from us. The tract opens in a tone of triumphant exultation at the "consternation" which Dr. Dixon's work will cause in the "enemy's camp;" not by its arguments, its learning, &c., all of which are duly praised, but by the discovery it will impart of the actual existence of a chair of Holy Scripture at Maynooth—a professorship not existing (*ex nomine*) in the universities of "the enemy." Cardinal Wiseman is mistaken if he supposes that the "enemy" will, on this discovery, jump to the simple conclusion that because Maynooth pays a professor, it must follow that, in a *bona fide* sense, "Scripture is there read, Scripture is studied, Scripture is expounded." The tree planted at Maynooth, like every tree in the garden of Christianity, must be submitted to the test appointed by our Lord himself, and be known by its fruits. Now, we are not disposed to inquire how far the alumnus of Maynooth comes up to the character which St. Paul describes as befitting a servant of God, who, he says, "must not wrangle, but be mild towards all men, apt to teach, patient, with modesty admonishing them that resist the truth."—2 Tim. ii. 24. Such an inquiry would afford no certain test of the nature and quality of the Scripture instruction at Maynooth; for, unhappily, there is too little mildness elsewhere also. We doubt not, too, that there are some excellent and pious priests who do read the Bible for themselves, though they may not feel at liberty to urge its study on the laity, but we are obliged, by the experience of others as well as our own, to say we seldom meet in Ireland a priest of Maynooth who even pretends to an intimate acquaintance of the Holy Scripture—to that head knowledge of it which is the peculiar fruit of the professor's labours. You may meet and converse with the Maynooth-educated priest in every steam boat, railway carriage, public place; you may see the rapid movement of his lips when engaged in the recital of his devotional exercises; you may observe in his hand the open Missal or the Breviary; but you seldom see with him a copy of the Douay or any other Bible; you can seldom trace, by his conversation or otherwise that he is a well-instructed or a habitual reader of Scripture. Until we see the fruits therefore, we are unable to believe that the tree of Scripture instruction, though it may be planted at Maynooth, has been properly nurtured and trained, so as to take deep root and flourish in the soil.

Cardinal Wiseman rejoices, that Dr. Dixon has taken possession of a ground, which, he says belongs of right exclusively to the "Catholic." Every Protestant, says he, who, if he reads the Bible at all, does not understand three words of what he reads, who does not practice one of its precepts, considers himself entitled to ask any Catholic, "why do

you not do as I do, make the Bible your rule of faith, and use the privilege of reading it and judging for yourself?" The Catholic, so interrogated, "knows that it is a foregone conclusion that all religion consists in reading, or pretending to read the Bible; that he who does not at least claim the privilege of reading it as he likes, though he may never use it, is something horrible, while he who boasts of it, and talks about it, secures some sort of religious pre-eminence here, and has a passport for the sort of fools paradise, which he considers Heaven to be."

The "Catholic," therefore, for want of courage, instead of saying, "and pray sir," (or "madam") what do you know about the Bible, or where did you get the book you call by that name, or how do you know that it is the Bible at all?" will assert that his Church *does* permit him and some others to read the Bible, thus admitting the principle of his adversary, instead of taking the "higher ground" of *denying the right of Protestants to use, much more their right to interpret the Bible*, to which, he says, they have no claim, and asserts that they "can prove neither its canon, its inspiration, nor its primary doctrines, except through that very authority which they are questioning."

Cardinal Wiseman writes exclusively for the "Catholic" reader, and draws freely enough upon his credulity and ignorance of Scripture, and consequently of true Protestantism. When he speaks of it as "decided by the newspapers and by Exeter Hall," that all religion consists in reading or pretending to read the Bible, or that the dry and barren reading of it, even without the "boasting and talking" he speaks of, gives any pre-eminence, or any privilege but that of better means of knowledge with the attendant increased responsibility, he greatly mistakes, or, at all events, mis-states the principles of Protestantism. He may be challenged to produce any evidence of the truth of his account of the Protestant notion of Scripture reading. No Protestant would insult the understanding of an assembly at Exeter Hall, or anywhere else, by asserting that the bare reading of the Bible gives one sinner a superiority over his fellow sinner. Protestants profess to take the Scripture as their guide, and it is not the hearing or the reading, but the doing of the word, the conformity of men's lives to its precepts, that they find inculcated in Scripture, and that they therefore profess to consider as the profitable fruit of its study.

Another misrepresentation of a different kind is the statement that Protestants cannot prove the canon, inspiration, &c., of the Bible, "save through the very authority they are questioning." The argument of Cardinal Wiseman would be lame, indeed, if he once admitted what Protestants insist upon, the internal evidence of inspiration afforded by the Scriptures. And as to the canon, it is a mistake to suppose that Protestants do not attach weight to the authority and practice of the Christian Church from the Apostolic age downwards. Not only was the canon of Scripture, as recognised by the early Church, adopted by Protestants of the Church of England in her Articles, but they made use of this evidence in support of the practice of infant baptism, the observance of the Sabbath, and other matters. What they deny is the infallibility of any Church; and they totally deny what Dr. Wiseman, of course, asserts, that the primitive Christian Church and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same. The infallible authority of the latter they reject; the legitimate power of the former they admit.

The Cardinal proceeds to compare the alleged cry of "the Bible! the Bible! nothing but the Bible," with the Jews senseless cry of the "Temple of the Lord," and describes the one to be as "perilous to salvation," as "rain, formal, and superstitious" as the other. As the temple became an idol and was destroyed, so he prophesies will the Bible be also removed—nay, the process he says, is actually going on; for, on the one hand the learned Protestantism of the continent is hastening into the abyss of infidelity, and dragging the Bible with it down to the level of an ordinary book, an uninspired old record; on the other hand the handling of it by the unlearned is destroying its vitality. The description of this process affords probably the best specimen of the Cardinal's style, and in our usual spirit of fair dealing, we transcribe his very words:—

"The holy, the sublime, the awful word of God, over which saints have meditated in cells for years of ineffable sweetness, yet of solemn reverence, round which scholars, pale with watching, have wreathed the flowers they have woven, or culled, in variegated commentaries; which the silver voice of virgins, or the deep tones of monks, have chaunted in breathless midnight, that no earthly sound might disturb the depth of their meditation; this compilation of the one spirit of God from the providence of centuries, through which alone He has lived; this treasure of spiritual honey, drawn from a thousand flowers of various delicacy of perfume and flavour, not mixing, but each preserved; this gem of natiⁿ price, reflecting in an infinite number of faces, the ever varying, yet constant image of God, in his might, in his sweetness, in his anger, in his love, in his unity, in his Trinity, in his heavens, on his earth, on Sinai and on Calvary; this noblest, greatest, divinest of things unsacramental, is put, indiscriminately, unceremoniously, into the hands of every one. It is the school-boy's task book, it is the jailor's present, it is the drunkard's pawned pledge, it is the dotard's text book, it is the irreverent jester's butt, it is the fanatic's justification for every vice, blasphemy, and profaneness which he commits. For into every one's hand it must needs be thrust, from the Chinese to the Ojibewa, from the Laplander to

the Bosjesman; from the child to the dotard, from the stuttering peasant to the gib self righteous old dame."

The argument proceeds to the effect, that there is no evidence but the word of the giver, that this book, so put into every hand, clean or unclean, is what it is called—the Word of God. There is no previous study, no demonstration of genuineness or information about the writers, &c. Full power is given to uninstructed minds to interpret it as they please, and to put any construction they please upon it, and it is asked what code of laws, moral or social, could, with safety, be thus treated? The Bible, it is alleged, is the most abstruse book extant, and allusion is made in proof of this to the genealogies of Genesis and Esdras, the architectural details of Exodus, Kings, and Ezekiel, the minutiae of the Levitical code, &c. To the objection supposed to be made to this argument—namely, that the "Bible-alone theory" does not exclude guidance in the use of Scripture, and that commentaries and expositions have been written by Protestants, and that reformed clergymen expound the Scriptures to their flocks—it is answered to the effect, first, that there is not one copy of any commentary sold for a hundred copies of the Bible given away—and, secondly, the great variety of opinions to which the indiscriminate use of the Scripture gives rise is relied upon. Every man goes to his own Church and preacher, and learns a different doctrine from that professed by others; so that the Scriptures, so given and thus variously interpreted, are "wrested by the unlearned and unstable to their own destruction." The dominions of Queen Pomare are pointed to in triumph, where it is alleged that, "under the judicious management of evangelical missionaries, a mild and promising people were transformed into a pack of lazy, immoral infidels." The slowness of the destructive effect in England of the Word of God is attributed to a "strong underground of old tradition" which the Reformation could not dig up, the "civilization interwoven with old truths," "a deference to rank and wealth," and attention is invited to the agencies at work to destroy "these preservative and conservative influences. The poisonings, infanticides, disregard of connubial ties, and increase of illegitimacy in the rural districts in England, and the infidel publications in towns, are pressed into service for this purpose, and, it is asserted, that the Bible is "unable to contend" with these evils. Modern science, electricity, and even mesmerism, are brought in aid, as furnishing new implements for the attempt to uproot the inspiration of Scripture miracles and prophecy. The two ways, therefore, in which the unlimited use of Scripture is leading to the destruction of this "ill-used blessing," and to the "spread of infidelity less intellectual and more sensual than German rationalism" consist—first, in the want of evidence that accompanies the Scriptures beyond the word of man; and secondly, in the innumerable varieties of opinion into which unlearned men, judging for themselves, must fall. An argument of Dr. Dixon is then touched upon, founded upon the following extract from a charge of the Bishop of London—"To deny the inspiration of Scripture is one step towards the rejection of the Gospel as a revelation from God. Against this fatal heresy I would earnestly caution my younger brethren," &c. And the following is quoted as Dr. Dixon's "pithy comment":—

"We are here told, and truly, that to deny inspiration is to embrace a fatal heresy. On the other hand, the Church of England, in her 6th Article, declares that 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.' We shall see, just now, how, by adhering to the doctrine of this article, any one can be convicted of fatal heresy, for denying the inspiration of Scripture." Dr. Wiseman proceeds to assure us that Dr. Dixon has established this point satisfactorily. He prefers, however, giving us his own logic on the subject, as follows:—

"A fatal heresy can only be the denial of an article of faith necessary to salvation. But, according to the Articles

nothing can be of faith which cannot be proved by Scripture; it follows, therefore, that the inspiration of Scripture is proved by Scripture: hence, we have this process of logical demonstration established. You are bound, under pain of heresy to believe in the inspiration of the Bible. But as no heresy can exist unless the doctrine which it contradicts be read in the Bible, it follows that you are obliged to believe in the inspiration of the Bible, because that inspiration is there declared. But belief in what is there taught, as an essential truth, to deny which is heresy, pre-supposes the recognition of the Bible as an inspired book; and, therefore, you are thrown back and forward, from one horn to the other; you believe in the Bible because it is inspired, and you believe it is inspired because you find it in the Bible."

The whole argument concludes with the following proposition:—

"The truth is comprised in a few words—'No infallible Church, no Bible.' On no less, on no other authority could such a tremendous fact be received; no weaker foundation will uphold it."

We have endeavoured to give a connected sketch of the substance of this argument; and, in order to do so, have resisted the frequent temptation to interrupt the thread of it with observations of our own. The first thing that strikes the mind of the Bible-reader on perusal of it is, the total rejection of the internal evidence (to which we have before